

1 BETSY C. MANIFOLD (182450)

manifold@whafh.com

2 RACHELE R. BYRD (190634)

byrd@whafh.com

3 BRITTANY N. DEJONG (258766)

dejong@whafh.com

4 **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER**

**FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**

5 750 B Street, Suite 1820

San Diego, CA 92101

6 Telephone: 619/239-4599

Facsimile: 619/234-4599

7 MARK C. RIFKIN (*pro hac vice*)

8 rifkin@whafh.com

9 MATTHEW M. GUINEY (*pro hac vice*)

guiney@whafh.com

10 **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER**

**FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**

11 270 Madison Avenue

New York, NY 10016

12 Telephone: 212/545-4600

Facsimile: 212/545-4677

13 Interim Class Counsel for the Plaintiffs in *In re Apple iPhone Antitrust Litigation*,

14 No. 4:11-cv-06714-YGR

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

16 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

18 EPIC GAMES, INC.,

Case No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR

19 Plaintiff,

**CONSUMER PLAINTIFFS' AMICUS BRIEF  
REGARDING TRIAL ELEMENTS, LEGAL  
FRAMEWORK AND REMEDIES**

20 vs.

21 **JUDGE:** Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
22 **CTRIM:** 1 – 4th Floor

23 APPLE INC.,

24 Defendant.

25 APPLE INC.,

26 Counterclaimant,

27 vs.

28 EPIC GAMES, INC.,

Counter-Defendant.

1 Pursuant to the Court’s October 21, 2020 Order (ECF No. 132), Plaintiffs in *In re Apple*  
 2 *iPhone Antitrust Litigation*, No. 4-11-cv-06714-YGR (the “Consumer Plaintiffs”) hereby submit  
 3 this *amicus* brief to respond to certain limited portions of the parties’ Joint Submission  
 4 Regarding Trial Elements, Legal Framework and Remedies (ECF No. 276) (the “Joint  
 5 Submission”). Consumer Plaintiffs reserve all their rights to address at a later date in *In re Apple*  
 6 *iPhone Antitrust Litigation*, No. 4-11-cv-06714-YGR, any issue addressed in the Joint  
 7 Submission, whether or not Consumer Plaintiffs address it in this *amicus* brief.

8 **I. Relevant Market—Product Market Definition (Joint Submission, § 4.1)**

9 **a. Analytical Framework (Joint Submission, § 4.1.1)**

10 Consumer Plaintiffs agree with the Undisputed Principles and Epic’s Position on the  
 11 Disputed Principles. With regard to Apple’s reference to two-sided transaction platforms,  
 12 Consumer Plaintiffs incorporate by reference their discussion of the distinction between two-  
 13 sided platforms in general and two-sided *transaction* platforms, *infra.*, a distinction which Apple  
 14 blurs.

15 **II. Single-Brand Markets (Joint Submission, § 4.1.2)**

16 Consumer Plaintiffs agree with the parties’ Undisputed Principles. Consumer Plaintiffs  
 17 also agree with Epic’s Position on the Disputed Principles, including its distinction of Apple’s  
 18 citations. *See* Joint Submission at 13-14.

19 In addition, to the extent Apple includes its discussion of a single-brand market involving  
 20 two-sided transaction platforms to imply that Apple’s App Store is a two-sided transaction  
 21 platform like the one described in *Ohio v. Am. Express Co.*, 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018) (“*Am. Ex.*”),  
 22 Consumer Plaintiffs dispute that implication. As the Supreme Court explained in *Am. Ex.*, a two-  
 23 sided transaction platform is “best understood as supplying only one product – *transactions* –  
 24 which is jointly consumed” by the parties on both sides of the platform. *Id.* at 2286 n.8. In  
 25 contrast, shortly after deciding *Am. Ex.*, the Supreme Court explained in *Apple v. Pepper*, 139 S.  
 26 Ct. 1514, 1518 (2019), that Apple’s App Store is an “electronic store where iPhone owners can  
 27 purchase iPhone applications from Apple.” *Id.* The Supreme Court did not identify the App  
 28 Store as a two-sided transaction platform because it does not sell a single product that is jointly

1 consumed by parties on both sides of the transaction the way that the ancillary credit card  
 2 transactions were in *Am. Ex.* The fact that Apple collects payments from its customers (iOS  
 3 device owners who download apps onto their devices) and remits payments to its suppliers (the  
 4 app developers) does not make the App Store a two-sided transaction platform any more than a  
 5 corner grocery, which does the same thing. *See also Pepper*, 139 S. Ct. at 1519 (Apple App  
 6 Store is a monopolistic retailer overcharging consumers); *id.* at 1523 (“If the retailer’s unlawful  
 7 monopolistic conduct caused a consumer to pay the retailer a higher-than-competitive price, the  
 8 consumer is entitled to sue the retailer under the antitrust laws.”)

9       The nature of the App Store does not change – and it does not become a two-sided  
 10 transaction platform – merely because consumers and suppliers have asserted independent claims  
 11 against Apple. “Multiple suits are not atypical when the intermediary in a distribution chain is a  
 12 bottleneck monopolist or monopsonist (or both) between the manufacturer on the one end and  
 13 the consumer on the other end. A retailer who is both a monopolist and a monopsonist may be  
 14 liable to different classes of plaintiffs – both to downstream consumers and to upstream suppliers  
 15 – when the retailer’s unlawful conduct affects both the downstream and upstream markets.”  
 16 *Pepper*, 139 S. Ct. at 1525.

17       Not all two-sided platforms fit the above description of a two-sided *transaction* platform.  
 18 For example, grocery stores, shopping malls, and the Apple App Store provide distinct services  
 19 to consumers and app developers, and consumers can visit those platforms without a clear  
 20 counterparty in mind (e.g., an app) for purchase. Therefore, they do not fit the definition of the  
 21 two-sided *transaction* platform discussed in *Am. Ex.*

22 **III. Two-Sided Platforms (Joint Submission, § 4.1.4)**

23       Consumer Plaintiffs agree with the Undisputed Principles and with Epic’s Position on the  
 24 Disputed Principles.

25       Further, to the extent Apple’s disputed position on two-sided platforms and its citation to  
 26 *Am. Ex.*, 138 S. Ct. at 2280, which involved a two-sided *transaction* platform, is meant to imply  
 27 that Apple’s App Store is a two-sided *transaction* platform, Consumer Plaintiffs dispute that  
 28 implication and incorporate by reference its discussion in Section II, *supra*.

1       Moreover, the “pronounced” indirect networks effects and “interconnected pricing and  
 2 demand” exhibited by the two-sided *transaction* platform at issue in *Am. Ex.* existed because of  
 3 the single, simultaneous transaction. *Id.*, 138 S. Ct. at 2286. Not all two-sided platforms  
 4 experience these effects and pricing and demand interconnection. Further, the platform in *US*  
 5 *Airways, Inc. v. Sabre Holdings Corp.*, 938 F.3d 43 (2d Cir. 2019), cited by Apple, was also a  
 6 two-sided *transaction* platform. *Id.* at 58.

7       **IV. Section 2 of the Sherman Act—Monopolization—Monopoly Power (Joint  
 8 Submission, § 7.1)**

9       Consumer Plaintiffs agree with the Undisputed Principles and with Epic’s Position on the  
 10 Disputed Principles. With regard to Apple’s citation to *Am. Ex.*, 138 S. Ct. at 2281 n.1 for the  
 11 proposition that in two-sided platform markets “[i]ndirect network effects [] limit [a] platform’s  
 12 ability to raise overall prices and impose a check on its market power,” Consumer Plaintiffs  
 13 incorporate herein by reference their discussion in Sections II and III, *supra*, of the distinction  
 14 between two-sided platforms in general and the two-sided *transaction* platform at issue in *Am.*  
 15 *Ex.* Not all two-sided platforms experience indirect network effects.

16       **V. Section 2 of the Sherman Act—Monopolization—Willful Maintenance of Monopoly  
 17 Power—Anticompetitive Effects (Joint Submission, § 7.2.2)**

18       Consumer Plaintiffs agree with the Undisputed Principles, except for the statement that in  
 19 a two-sided market, courts must take into consideration the effects of the defendant’s conduct on  
 20 both sides of the market, citing *Am. Ex.*, 138 S. Ct. at 2287. As discussed *supra* in Sections II  
 21 through IV, the two-sided platform in *Am. Ex.* was a two-sided *transaction* platform. While that  
 22 statement may be accurate as to two-sided *transaction* platforms, it does not apply to all two-  
 23 sided platforms.

24       Consumer Plaintiffs agree with Epic’s Position. With regard to Apple’s discussion of  
 25 two-sided transaction platforms, Consumer Plaintiffs incorporate by reference their discussion of  
 26 this issue in Sections II through IV, *supra*.

27       ///

28       ///

1 DATED: February 5, 2021

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER  
FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**

BETSY C. MANIFOLD  
RACHELE R. BYRD  
BRITTANY N. DEJONG

/s/ Rachele R. Byrd  
RACHELE R. BYRD

750 B Street, Suite 1820  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: 619/239-4599  
Facsimile: 619/234-4599

**WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER  
FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**  
MARK C. RIFKIN  
MATTHEW M. GUINEY  
270 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
Telephone: 212/545-4600  
Facsimile: 212/545-4677

Interim Class Counsel for Consumer Plaintiffs in  
*In re Apple iPhone Antitrust Litigation*,  
No. 4-11-cv-06714-YGR

Apple2:27029

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Alexandra Loutsenhizer, the undersigned, declare:

1. That declarant is and was, at all times herein mentioned a resident of the County of San Diego, over the age of 18 years, and not a party to or interested in the within action; that declarant's business address is 750 B Street, Suite 1820, San Diego, CA 92101.

2. That on February 5, 2021, declarant served the foregoing:

## **CONSUMER PLAINTIFFS' AMICUS BRIEF REGARDING TRIAL ELEMENTS, LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND REMEDIES**

by electronic mail to the counsel listed on the attached service list.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 5th day of February 2021, at San Diego, California.

ALEXANDRA LOUTSENHIZER

27031

IN RE APPLE iPHONE ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case Nos.: 4:20-cv-05640-YGR-TSH; 4:11-cv-06714-YGR-TSH; 4:19-cv-03074-YGR-TSH

Service List – February 1, 2021

Page 1

PLAINTIFFS' INTERIM CLASS COUNSEL

Betsy C. Manifold

Rachele R. Byrd

Brittany N. DeJong

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER

FREEMAN & HERZ LLP

750 B Street, Suite 1820

San Diego, CA 92101

619/239-4599

619/234-4599 (fax)

manifold@whafh.com

byrd@whafh.com

dejong@whafh.com

Mark C. Rifkin

Matthew M. Guiney

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER

FREEMAN & HERZ LLP

270 Madison Ave.

New York, NY 10016

212/545-4600

212/545-4677 (fax)

rifkin@whafh.com

guiney@whafh.com

David C. Frederick

KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD,

FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.

1615 M Street, NW Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036

202/326-7900

202/326-7999 (fax)

dfrederick@kellogghansen.com

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT APPLE INC.

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.

Richard J. Doren

Daniel G. Swanson

Jay P. Srinivasan

Dana Lynn Craig

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

333 South Grand Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

213/229-7000

213/229-7520 (fax)

tboutrous@gibsondunn.com

rdoren@gibsondunn.com

dswanson@gibsondunn.com

jsrinivasan@gibsondunn.com

dcraig@gibsondunn.com

Cynthia E. Richman

Harry R. S. Phillips

Mark A. Perry

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036-5306

202/955-8234

202/530-9691 (fax)

crichman@gibsondunn.com

hphillips2@gibsondunn.com

mperry@gibsondunn.com

Veronica S. Lewis

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

2100 McKinney Avenue, Suite 1100

Dallas, TX 75201

214/698-3100

214/571-2900 (fax)

vlewis@gibsondunn.com

Ethan Dettmer

Eli M. Lazarus

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

555 Mission Street, Suite 3000

San Francisco, CA 94105-0921

415/393-8200

415/393-8306 (fax)

edettmer@gibsondunn.com

elazarus@gibsondunn.com

AppleAppStoreDiscovery@gibsondunn.com

David R. Eberhart

Anna T. Pletcher

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

Two Embarcadero Center, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

415/984-8700

415/984-8701 (fax)

deberhart@omm.com

apletcher@omm.com

Katrina Robson

Evan Schlom

Elena Zarabozo

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

1625 Eye Street NW

Washington, DC 20006

202/383-5300

202/383-5414 (fax)

krobsen@omm.com

eschlom@omm.com

IN RE APPLE iPhone ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Service List – January 1, 2021

Page 2

ezarabozo@omm.com

510/725-3000

510/725-3001 (fax)

shanas@hbsslaw.com

bens@hbsslaw.com

benh@hbsslaw.com

Scott Schaeffer  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
Plaza 66, Tower 1, 37<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1266 Nanjing Road West  
Shanghai 200040, China  
86-21-2307-7000  
86-21-2307-7300 (fax)  
sschaeffer@omm.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERESTED PARTY EPIC GAMES, INC.

Christine A. Varney  
Katherine B. Forrest  
Gary A. Bornstein  
Yonatan Even  
Lauren A. Moskowitz  
M. Brent Byars  
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP  
825 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10019  
212/474-1000  
212/474-3700  
cvarney@cravath.com  
kforrest@cravath.com  
gbornstein@cravath.com  
yeven@cravath.com  
lmoskowitz@cravath.com  
mbyars@cravath.com  
epic-mobileapps@cravath.com

Michelle Lowery  
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
2049 Century Park East, Suite 3200  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206  
310/277-4110  
310/277-4730 (fax)  
mslowery@mwe.com

Hannah L. Cannom  
Bethany M. Stevens  
WALKER STEVENS CANNOM LLP  
500 Molina Street #118  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
213/337-9972  
213/403-4906  
hcannom@wscllp.com  
bstevens@wscllp.com

DEVELOPER PLAINTIFFS' INTERIM CLASS COUNSEL

Steve W. Berman  
Robert F. Lopez  
Ronnie Seidel Spiegel  
Ted Wojcik  
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98101  
206/623-7292  
206/623-0594 (fax)  
steve@hbsslaw.com  
robl@hbsslaw.com  
ronnie@hbsslaw.com  
tedw@hbsslaw.com

Paul J. Riehle  
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
415/591-7500  
415/591-7510 (fax)  
paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com

Shana E. Scarlett  
Benjamin J. Siegel  
Ben Harrington  
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202  
Berkeley, CA 94710